UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

WINSTON BERNARD EISON,

Plaintiff,

٧.

Case No. 12-CV-931

MARY ROZMARYNOSKI,

Defendant,

ORDER

Plaintiff, who is incarcerated at Green Bay Correctional Institution, filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated. This matter comes before the court on the plaintiff's petition to proceed in forma pauperis.

The plaintiff is required to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). If a prisoner does not have the money to pay the filing fee, he or she can request leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The plaintiff has filed a certified copy of his prison trust account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of his complaint, as required under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2), and has been assessed and paid an initial partial filing fee of \$12.43, as well as additional partial filing fees of \$11.32, \$11.32, \$10.70, and \$11.39.

The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which

relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Hutchinson ex rel. Baker v. Spink, 126 F.3d 895, 900 (7th Cir. 1997). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327. "Malicious," although sometimes treated as a synonym for "frivolous," "is more usefully construed as intended to harass." Lindell v. McCallum, 352 F.3d 1107, 1109-10 (7th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

To state a cognizable claim under the federal notice pleading system, the plaintiff is required to provide a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). It is not necessary for the plaintiff to plead specific facts and his statement need only "give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). However, a complaint that offers "labels and conclusions" or "formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555). To state a claim, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, "that is plausible on its face." Id. (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570). "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." Id. (citing

Twombly, 550 U.S. at 556). The complaint allegations "must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 (citation omitted).

In considering whether a complaint states a claim, courts should follow the principles set forth in <u>Twombly</u> by first, "identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth." <u>Iqbal</u>, 556 U.S. at 679. Legal conclusions must be supported by factual allegations. <u>Id.</u> If there are well-pleaded factual allegations, the court must, second, "assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief." Id.

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: 1) he was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States; and 2) the deprivation was visited upon him by a person or persons acting under color of state law. Buchanan-Moore v. County of Milwaukee, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009) (citing Kramer v. Village of North Fond du Lac, 384 F.3d 856, 861 (7th Cir. 2004)); see also Gomez v. Toledo, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). The court is obliged to give the plaintiff's pro se allegations, "however inartfully pleaded," a liberal construction. See Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

According to his complaint, on August 3, 2011, after a disruptive prisoner was gassed, plaintiff was ordered to clean the contaminated cell as part of his janitorial duty. The institution was out of stock of the protective gear plaintiff was supposed to be provided with for cleaning a gas contaminated cell, so he cleaned the contaminated cell in his regular prison uniform. While cleaning, plaintiff's clothes, skin, eyes, nose, mouth, and lungs became saturated with the gas, and he began sneezing and coughing and his eyes, skin and nose began badly burning and itching. Although plaintiff and other correctional

officers informed defendant Correctional Officer Rozmarynoski that plaintiff needed to take an immediate shower, she refused to allow him to take one. As a result, plaintiff spent the night in distress, and incurred a medical co-pay.

Plaintiff may proceed on a claim that his Eighth Amendment rights were violated by defendant's refusal to permit him to shower and decontaminate after he cleaned a cell in which an incapacitating gas was used.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. # 2) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to an informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this court, copies of plaintiff's complaint and this order are being electronically sent today to the Wisconsin Department of Justice for service on the state defendant.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that, pursuant to the informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this court, the defendant shall file a responsive pleading to the complaint within sixty days of receiving electronic notice of this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections or his designee shall collect from the plaintiff's prison trust account the \$292.84 balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from the plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's trust account and forwarding payments to the clerk of the court each time the

amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The

payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that a copy of this order be sent to the warden of the

institution where the inmate is confined.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to the Prisoner E-Filing Pilot Project, the

plaintiff shall submit all correspondence and case filings to institution staff, who will scan

and e-mail documents to the Court. The Prisoner E-Filing Pilot Project is in effect only at

Green Bay Correctional Institution and, therefore, if the plaintiff is no longer incarcerated

there, he will be required to submit all correspondence and legal material to:

Honorable Lynn Adelman
% Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
Eastern District of Wisconsin

Eastern District of Wisconsin 362 United States Courthouse

517 E. Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

The plaintiff is further advised that failure to make a timely submission may result

in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.

In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address.

Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus

affecting the legal rights of the parties.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 20th day of February, 2013.

s/ Lynn Adelman

LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge

5